



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

of a concerted carnival.”<sup>9</sup> As a form of constructed knowledge, genealogies involve shortcuts, selective argumentation, and a lot of imagination—they are ludic. The truth, it would seem, is never easy to uncover and perhaps it is only ever constructed. We might ask: does it matter if history is made up of fictions, desire, and lots of judicious editing rather than being “the truth”? Is history ever “the truth” or just one version of “the truth”? Napier manages to be interesting and cogent in her discussion of the issues surrounding a history of imagination and desire. Her account of the West’s engagement with Japan is an important and entertaining version of the truth as well as a testament to her erudition and love of Japanese fantasy. Do not be put off by its rather grim, grey cover: this is a book well worth reading.

*Full Metal Apache: Transactions between Cyberpunk Japan and Avant-Pop America.* By Takayuki Tatsumi. Duke University Press, Durham, 2007. xxvi, 241 pages. \$22.95, paper.

*Reviewed by*  
THOMAS LAMARRE  
McGill University

As the title announces with its provocative juxtaposition of iconic references, this is a book about making and reading types, about typing or typography. The author revels in types that play against type, which thus promise to unravel the normative implications of cultural typing or stereotypes. Sometimes Takayuki Tatsumi finds that looking closely, even obsessively, at a familiar and apparently stable icon—Audrey Hepburn, Godzilla, Adolf Hitler, John F. Kennedy, Bill Clinton—is enough to twist or deform it. Sometimes it is a matter of mixing or remixing iconic types in order to generate strange new hybrid types—full metal apache, human cattle, drag gynoids, undead kappa, techno-sexual kamikaze, cyborg emperor. In types generally, but especially in iconic or generic types, Tatsumi consistently seeks something that goes beyond simple typing. He looks for their surplus, their generative and potentially transformative force. His account thus runs counter to analyses that see in the continual transformation of types a process of regulated difference or supplementation, in which variety and diversity are ever in the service of producing more of the same for the cultural marketplace. The emphasis is on the creativity, not the normativity, of popular culture and literature.

The challenge of the book comes from how Tatsumi works through

9. Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,” p. 94.

questions about typing in three registers: as a historical transformation in Japan-America transactions (toward synchronicity), as a kind of literature (paraliterature), and as a manner of reading literature (critical Orientalism). Historically, he posits an era of stereotypes, which he further characterizes in terms of “hardcore orientalism” and imperialist assimilation. Orientalist stereotyping also corresponds to the first of three stages of mimicry, the stage of imitation, in which there is a strong sense of the hierarchy of original and copy. Because this sort of exoticism allows for the establishment and maintenance of cultural hierarchies, it goes hand in hand with the construction of others to enable domination over them—hence the association of the stereotype with imperialist assimilation. In contrast, the twisting, deforming, and remixing of cultural stereotypes is typical of a subsequent stage of mimicry, that of synchronicity, which emerges in the 1980s in tandem with the promise of a Pax Japonica. Tatsumi intermittently characterizes this stage in terms of multiculturalism and “multicultural miscegenation” (p. 80).

Tatsumi also detects the emergence of a third stage of chaotic negotiations in the 1990s. Yet, because chaotic negotiations only make an appearance in the last pages of the conclusion, and because they follow directly from synchronicity, it seems fair to say that the focus of the book is the passage from imitation to synchronicity, from imperialist assimilation to multicultural miscegenation, which is simultaneously a passage from modern to postmodern.

For all of the book’s historical gestures, however, its goal is not primarily to arrive at a historical understanding of Japan-U.S. cultural relations but to find a new manner of thinking about Japan. Consequently, the emphasis is on American and Japanese fictions about Japan. The sensibility of the book is largely that of postwar Japan. Although Tatsumi shows a keen awareness of Japan’s history as a colonizer, the implicit point of reference is the postwar moment when the Japanese national economy and culture became organized primarily around Japan’s relations with the United States. Because this quasi-colonial situation threatened to constrain Japan to a purely reactive role, Tatsumi looks for moments of Japaneseness that are not inscribed in advance in circuits of influence and reaction. In this respect, the trajectory of the book is ethical rather than historical. The idea is not to show how Japan in the 1980s finally succeeds in overcoming its reactive subjection to the United States. Rather, the possibility of Japan-U.S. parity or synchronicity spurs or enables a different way of thinking about Japan.

In sum, synchronicity is not so much a historical fact as a mode of ethical evaluation, grounding a distinction between bad and good Orientalisms. There is bad Orientalism, whose stereotypes align with imperialist assimilation, domination, and modernization. Yet there is also a good Orientalism, a critical Orientalism that perversely twists and remixes stereotypes, thus

offering a way to expose or undermine the very operations of Orientalism. Tatsumi alternately styles this critical operation as postorientalism, post-occidentalism, neo-exoticism, and neo-Japonism. Such a proliferation of labels sometimes makes it difficult to determine what exactly is at stake. Diverse formations of modernity—modernization, Orientalism, Occidentalism, imperialism, patriarchy—become loosely grouped together, blurring distinctions between sites and modes of power associated with domination, exploitation, and subjectification. Moreover, the different modes of relation implied in different fixtures such as “post-” and “neo-” and “-oid” are frequently conflated. Nevertheless, the basic idea is critical Orientalism: to explore how formerly dominant or hegemonic regimes of typing can be twisted or perverted beyond recognition—or, rather, *almost* beyond recognition. It is as if the stereotype were now stretched like taffy between two equally powerful poles of attraction, warping and flattening under the pressure.

Synchronicity then is less a historical fact than a social imaginary that grounds a manner of reading, not only of 1980s fiction but also of earlier, quintessentially modern literature. Chapter 4, for instance, offers a “post-occidental reading” of Lafcadio Hearn and Yanagita Kunio in which “Hearn’s literary orientation reflected an interest not in imperialist assimilation but rather in multicultural miscegenation” (p. 80), and Tatsumi proposes to celebrate rather than denigrate Yanagita’s folkloric tradition as an example of cultural hybridization (p. 79). Tatsumi’s reading is justifiably “postoccidental” in the sense that it goes one step beyond the now almost rote exposure of the Western origins of what is habitually deemed purely Japanese, to insist on miscegenation and hybridization within the Western origin as well. Simply put, neither Japan nor the West is pure: both are contaminated at their origin. Especially striking is Tatsumi’s dexterity as he looks at Hearn, Yanagita, and Akutagawa Ryūnosuke through the lens of Murano Tetsutarō’s 1982 film of Yanagita’s *Tōno monogatari* (Tales of Tōno), carefully weaving a tale of pure love that is also miscegenation—love between species.

Relations between species are also central to chapter 3, in which Tatsumi offers a postorientalist reading of yellow peril literature of the 1890s, tracing its legacy through H. G. Wells to Arthur C. Clarke and recent films, in order to show that the alien species that appear in science fiction are inextricable from racial others. Again, the manner of reading depends on close attention to the ways in which the racial and Orientalist stereotypes associated with imperialism become twisted, deformed, reworked, and remixed. Tatsumi’s postorientalist reading remains oddly noncommittal about the value of these examples of interspecies war, and yet his tone differs: interspecies war does not evoke the same critical enthusiasm as interspecies love. Similarly, in his many remarks about the combination of xenophobia and

xenophilia that characterizes fascination for the other, there is an overall tendency to affirm a trajectory from xenophobia to xenophilia. One gets the sense that xenophobia spurs or prepares for xenophilia, or xenophilia lurks beyond xenophobia. This trajectory amounts to more than an unexplained optimism that enemies may learn to make love, not war. It is a matter of finding love in all the wrong places, as when Tatsumi finds queer love of a British boy for the Japanese kamikaze at the origin of J. G. Ballard's techn erotic fiction (chapter 5).

As such examples suggest, the presumption of synchronicity between Japan and America provides a basis for locating instances of xenophilic attraction at the very heart of xenophobic stereotypes. Synchronicity as a manner of reading gravitates toward a sort of textual sociability that entails making odd introductions and looking for chance encounters, unexpected commonalities, and coincidences. The bulk of a chapter frequently hinges on the introduction of authors, on summaries of texts or plays or films, and sometimes on presentation of themes and genre. But the goal is, of course, to introduce the one author (or work or theme) to the other and to look for mutual interests. Sometimes there is an obvious connection; the one author already knows and likes the other, even if they have not actually met. More interesting, however, are the occasions when Tatsumi finds a pretext for bringing figures together. The pretext can feel forced, as when he connects Tsukamoto Shin'ya to Thomas Pynchon (p. 154), but, on the whole, the dexterity of Tatsumi's manner of reading lies in its discovery of apparently coincidental points of intersection that gain in persuasiveness as he brings two authors together in novel ways. A prime example is the analysis of William Gibson's *Virtual Light* in chapter 8, in which a fleeting reference to Akasegawa Genpei allows for more formal introductions to take place between Gibson and Akasegawa and thus between American cyberpunk and Japanese neo-Dadaism.

Significantly, this encounter hinges on the twisting of a type—Thomasson, an American baseball player, very handsome and powerful, who received a large salary to play in Japan yet turned out to be unable to hit the ball. Similarly, in chapter 10, in the exploration of “negotiations” between Terayama Shuji, Béla Bartók, and Edgar Allan Poe, the cyborg provides the nodal point around which the formal presentations and introductions take place. Likewise in other chapters, unusual figures such as full metal apache, undead kappa, and queer robots not only imply a distinctive manner of thinking about types (critical Orientalism) but also ground a manner of reading across texts via a network of apparent coincidences and glancing intersections (tangents).

Such use of unusual, novel, deformed, perverse types as nodal points to construct novel assemblages of authors and artists evokes not only the prototypical network (with two to three degrees of separation) but also the ar-

chetype. After all, classic Jungian theories of the archetype make reference to types that are internally contradictory, whose inherent instability makes them objects of fascination prone to affection and displacement, whence their therapeutic power. The risk of twisting and remixing stereotypes, then, is that of reinventing or renewing archetypes. One might well argue that stereotypes are always already archetypes and that making and reading types always entails forms of hybridization and miscegenation. A great deal thus depends on whether one thinks that modern imperialism and colonialism entailed strict binary oppositions and subjective technologies geared toward isolating and purifying identities (regimes of stereotypes), or whether one thinks that modern modes of subjectification also entailed the deformation of types, hybridization, and miscegenation (regimes of archetypes). Inevitably, questions about the relation between stereotype and archetype return us to questions about the historical relation between the stages of imitation and synchronicity, between the modern and the postmodern. And, as the term “synchronicity” attests, questions about historical relations tend here to take the form of temporal relations.

If miscegenation implies for Tatsumi a radical leveling of racial hierarchies, synchronicity implies an analogous flattening of temporal hierarchies between Japan and the United States. Tatsumi refers to the postwar acceleration of travel, translation, and general transactions between the two countries that gradually made it difficult to think of Japan-U.S. relations in terms of a temporal lag. In other words, it is as if a mode of racialization (stereotypes) were equally a mode of temporalization, of putting the other in the past.<sup>1</sup>

Interestingly enough, Tatsumi acknowledges futurity as at once misperception of Japan and (unconscious) truth. He writes, “Gibson’s Chiba City may have sprung from his misperception of Japan, but it was this misperception that encouraged Japanese readers to correctly perceive the nature of postmodernist Japan. In short, the moment that we perceive cyberpunk stories that misperceive Japan, we are already perceived correctly by cyberpunk” (p. 111). It is as if Japanese futurity could function as an enunciative position from which the ghost of Japan’s temporal unevenness *vis-à-vis* the United States might be effectively summoned and maybe exorcized. Japanese futurity is manifest in the dazzling array of neologisms and techno-hip terminology, as well as bold provocations that “we are all Japanoid” or “we are all queer.” Naturally, depending on the reader, such rhetoric might

1. Johannes Fabian’s critique of temporal othering comes to mind here, especially because he insisted that our task should be to begin with the coevalness of the other. While Tatsumi’s notion of synchronicity has some affinity with Fabian’s coevalness, synchronicity differs in one crucial respect. Synchronicity goes hand in hand with the projection of Japan into the future, whence the lure of American cyberpunk: Japan is now the future. It is as if the American habit of projecting Japan into the past could only be overcome through a complete inversion of received ideas about Japan’s need to catch up with America. Synchronicity conjures forth nonsynchronicity, here it is futurity.

feel hip and now or appear forced and outdated. Nonetheless, the enunciative gesture of projecting Japan into the future merits critical attention and scholarly consideration in relation to the project of critical Orientalism put forth in *Full Metal Apache*. This enunciative futurity is not merely temporal or racial overcompensation or frank disavowal of the temporal unevenness of the Japanese present. Rather, it highlights a situation in which formations of modernity, especially the strategies of racial and temporal othering implicit in Orientalist typing, have become so irrevocably a part of our contemporary condition that “I” cannot be withdrawn from it, temporally or spatially. “I” is a twist of the type.

*Yōko Tawada: Voices from Everywhere*. Edited by Doug Slaymaker. Lexington Books, Lanham, Md., 2007. xi, 174 pages. \$60.00, cloth; \$24.95, paper.

*Reviewed by*  
IRMELA HIJYA-KIRSCHNEREIT  
Freie Universität Berlin

For a long time, the notion of “Japanese literature” propagated in dictionaries and encyclopedias was straightforward, reminding us of the sweeping generalizations in *Nihonjinron* literature of “the Japanese” with their presupposed identity of ethnicity, language, culture, geography, and nation. “Japanese literature” (*kokubungaku*, or “national literature”) was seldom defined at all. Scholarly works on literature, of course, paint a more complex picture, such as Konishi Jin’ichi’s introductory reflections on what to consider under the term in his monumental *History of Japanese Literature*, in which he problematizes the monoculturality as well as the monolingual nature of the notion.<sup>1</sup> Yet the common view held in and outside Japan remains relatively simple, suggesting that the issue concerns literary texts written in Japanese by ethnic Japanese, being Japanese nationals, set mainly in Japan. While this is not the place to discuss the implications of this simplistic and distorted image, the observation may serve as a starting point for introducing a recent publication on Tawada Yōko, a writer with distinct profiles in Japan and Germany and thus a figure who thoroughly disrupts the neat categorizations common for “Japanese literature.”

Tawada’s biography links her to both countries and cultures. Born in Tokyo in 1960, she studied Russian literature at Waseda University and

1. Jin’ichi Konishi, *A History of Japanese Literature, Vol. 1*, trans. Aileen Gatten and Nicholas Teele, ed. Earl Miner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 3, 34–35, 42–45, 121–23.